

Central Intelligence Agency Office of the Deputy Director for Intelligence

Imc/cB TMG07

14 April 1983

NOTE TO: Tom Cormack

**Executive Secretary** 

FROM Deputy Director for Intelligence

Attached is our more detailed response to the Director's question on Angola and the Clark Amendment.

Robert M. Gates

25X1

Near Duplicate of C05511517: RIP ALA M 83-10060

Sanitized Co	ppy Approved for Release 2010/07/21 : CIA-RE	DP85T00287R000400320002-3	25 <b>X</b> 1
•			
		14 April 1983	
MEMORANDUM			
SUBJECT:	ANGOLA: Impact of Clark Amendmen	t	25 <b>X</b> 1
1. The	following is the DDI's response to yo	ur request for information	
concerning th	he insurgency in Angola and the impact dum supplements the one we provided ye	of the Clark Amendment.	25X <b>25X1</b>
assistance to authorization Senate in Fel June 1976. held the att	Clark Amendment, prohibiting the gran o insurgent groups in Angola without en, was originally introduced in Decemberuary 1976, and signed into law by the debate in the US over the Clark Amention of the contending forces in Anghad little effect on the fighting ther	xpress Congressional er 1975, approved by the e President at the end of endment during this period ola, but in our judgment the	25X1
independence guerrilla grain January 19 Angola (FNLA (UNITA), and ethnic and idadvantages of especially supported by	kground. The Alvor accord, in which P to a transitional government comprise oups, began to break down almost immed 975. The three groups—the National F), the National Union for the Total In the Popular Movement for the Liberati deological rivals. The MPLA at that twer the other two movements. An urban trong in and around the capital city, a majority of educated Angolans. Its ted Marxist who had been able to submerganization.	d of Angola's three major iately after it was signed ront for the Liberation of dependence of Angola on of Angola (MPLA)were ime enjoyed important -based groupit was Luandathe MPLA was leader, Agostinho Neto, was	25X1
regard to leaforeign assis	MPLA in 1975 thus had a considerable adership and political organization. stance more readily than its competito nd from a pro-MPLA bias among many Por	It was also able to absorb rs. It benefited both from	25 <b>X</b> 1
groups, drew northern Ango generally co received mate from Beijing ultimately p	FNLA, ethnically the most narrowly-ba its support almost exclusively from to la and southwestern Zaire. Under Holnsidered the most pro-Western of Angoleriel support from neighboring Zaire a. Despite organizational and leadersh roved fatal to the FNLA, at independent strong military force.	he Bakongo people in den Roberto, the FNLA was a's liberation groups. It nd considerable assistance ip weaknesses that	25X1
		ALA M 83-10060	OEV4
			25X1

SECRET

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2010/07/21 : CIA-RDP85T00287R000400320002-3

6. UNITA, formed by Jonas Savimbi in 1966 after he had broken away from the FNLA, as of 1975 was the smallest of the three groups. Militarily it was by far the weakest, in terms of both manpower and foreign support. UNITA's potential at the time rested largely on the abilities of its charismatic leader, Jonas Savimbi, and on its ability to draw support from the country's largest tribal group, the Ovimbundu. These factors would prove to be important long-term assets.
7. The Military Struggle. The first clashes among the groups occurred

- 7. The Military Struggle. The first clashes among the groups occurred in early 1975 and mostly involved the FNLA and the MPLA. In February and March 1975, the FNLA seemed to have the military advantage and was frequently on the attack. But Soviet military aid to the MPLA began to increase at around that time, and the military balance soon shifted. Shortly thereafter, it became apparent that the types and amounts of weapons being acquired by the MPLA--including artillery, rockets, and recoilless rifles--could not be matched by their opponents. Nor could the FNLA and UNITA compete with the MPLA's superior organizational and combat skills. By mid-1975 the MPLA was consistently able to take the offensive. MPLA successes, first against the FNLA in the north and later against UNITA in the south, forced the latter groups to form an uneasy coalition.
- 8. Cuban intervention on the side of the MPLA beginning in the early fall of 1975 greatly enhanced the MPLA's military position. The FNLA-UNITA coalition sought assistance from South Africa. Pretoria responded first with arms and training, and during the fall it sent in around 1,500 troops. FNLA forces in the north—supported by Zairian troops—and South African, UNITA, and some FNLA troops advancing from the south temporarily succeeded in turning the tide of battle against the MPLA by the end of October 1975. This led the Soviets to mount a major airlift of arms and Cuban troops into Angola during the last two months or so of 1975. The Cubans had around 11,000 troops in Angola by December.
- 9. The massive Cuban intervention dramatically turned the tide in favor of the MPLA in early 1976. Major defeats were inflicted on the ill-disciplined FNLA and Zairian troops in the north. The Cuban and MPLA forces did not fare nearly as well at first against South African and UNITA forces in the south, but Pretoria's decision to withdraw its troops starting in January 1976—in part because of the controversy in the US Congress over continued aid to UNITA and the FNLA—was followed by major MPLA and Cuban gains against UNITA.
- 10. The Clark Amendment. The Clark Amendment, in our judgment, did not have a decisive effect on the military situation. It is our assessment that greater outside aid to UNITA and/or the FNLA would not have enabled them to defeat the MPLA and Cuban forces.
- 11. The large Soviet military aid effort and particularly the introduction of thousands of Cuban combat troops were the most important

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

	Amendment, South African forces might well have remained involved in the conflict for a time, but it is debatable whether Pretoria would have been willing over the long term to pay the domestic and international political costs of a protracted struggle. In any case, it is doubtful that the South Africans could have matched the Soviet and Cuban effort. They probably	25X1
	concluded by early 1976 that the forces they were backing could not win.	25X1
		25 <b>X</b> 1
	12. <u>Subsequent Developments</u> . By mid-February 1976, Savimbi's forces had retreated into a remote area of southeastern Angola, which became the base for their long-term querrilla struggle against the Cuban-backed regime. In	d r
	UNITA's only major external backer, but the organization has continued to develop politically and militarily and today it poses a serious threat to the	20/1
	MPLA regime.	25 <b>X</b> 1
	13. FNLA forces, for their part, retreated in 1976 to the bush in northern Angola and into southern Zaire. The FNLA is now virtually moribund, beset by factionalism, poor leadership, and lack of outside support. It pose no threat to the MPLA.	<b>s</b> 25X1
		25X1

SUBJECT: ANGOLA: Impact of Clark Amendment

## Distribution:

Orig - DCI

1 - DDCI

1 - ED/DCI

1 - SA/DCI/IA

1 - Exec Registry

1 - DDI

1 - NIO/Africa

1 - NIC/AG

1 - PDB Staff

1 - C/DDI/PES

2 - D/ALA

2 - ALA/PS

1 - ALA Research Director

4 - OCPAS/IMC/CB

9 - ALA/SCD

DDI/ALA/SCD/C (14 April 83)

25X1